

Serial No. 09/921,480  
Examiner: D. Nguyen  
Art Unit: 3752  
March 5, 2004  
Page 6

### REMARKS

In the Office action, the Abstract was objected to for being in excess of 150 words. Claims 1-7, 12 and 13 were provisionally rejected for double patenting in view of application 09/921,465; claims 1 and 3 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 1, 2, 4 and 14-20 were rejected as anticipated by Madden; and claims 1, 4 and 12-20 were rejected as anticipated by Friel.

The abstract is amended to be of proper word count and also more directed to the subject matter of the claims pending.

As to the double patenting rejection, the claims of the co-pending application 09/921,465 were amended after the present Office action was issued. It is believed that the two pending applications no longer have claims subject to a 101 double patenting rejection, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the configuration program presents a menu of material application system components selection options and that the user input device provides input data comprising material application system operating criteria. The configuration program further verifies component compatibility. The art of record makes no suggestion of such a claimed system. None of Friel, Madden or Jahn relate to configuring a material application system as claimed. Madden relates to control of an assembly line, Friel relates to a mixing system for paint, and Jahn relates to coordinating paint-related process steps. Jahn does not relate to configuring the paint application system from a remote location but rather monitoring and controlling an already installed application system.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2004

By: Leonard L. Lewis

Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176  
(216) 622-8683  
Customer No. 27483